

REMARKS

The following Remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action issued on November 15, 2006 in connection with the above-identified patent application.

Claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 16 are independent claims. No claims have been canceled or amended.

Claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0199867 (“Brandenborg”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To anticipate, the cited reference must teach every element of every rejected claim in the above-identified patent application and such a teaching must be as complete in detail as the claim in the above-identified patent application. MPEP § 2131. Brandenborg does not teach “receiving a selection of a piece of content, the content including at least one item therein, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content” as recited in claims 1 and 16. As recited by the Examiner, “Brandenborg discloses Publishing Content Objects (PCOs), which are created and managed in the content management system.” (Office Action ¶ 6). The content management system that is based on one or several databases includes publication contents as Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) stored therein. (Page 1, [0008]-[0009]). The Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) include associated metadata fields describing the objects like purpose, origination, state, type, deadline, etc. *Id.* Merely disclosing Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) with metadata does not teach “receiving a selection of a piece of content, the content including at least one item therein, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content” as recited in claims 1 and 16. For example, Applicant submits that the Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) and the metadata corresponding thereto described in Brandenborg is not receiving a selection of a piece of content with an item describing a pre-defined portion of the content as part of an editing process as claimed. Instead, Brandenborg discloses a layout budget that may be executed by performing a selection of a subset of metadata based on a grading, or rank, of the metadata and publishing, or displaying, the Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) associated with the subset of metadata. (Page 2, [0028]; Page 4, [0050]; Page 6, [0112]).

Furthermore, Brandenborg does not teach as complete in detail as necessary to anticipate “receiving a selection of a piece of content, the content including at least one item therein, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content” as recited in claims 1 and 16. Merely disclosing Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) with metadata does not contain sufficient detail to anticipate receiving a selection of a piece of content with an item describing a pre-defined portion of the content as part of an editing process. Accordingly, Brandenborg does not anticipate the claim limitation “receiving a selection of a piece of content, the content including at least one item therein, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content” as claimed.

Brandenborg also does not teach “receiving a selection of an edit form separate from the content, the edit form including at least one control therein, each control being available for receiving an item of the content and for specifying attributes relating to displaying the received item in a page that is to be served to a requester thereof;” “receiving a selection of a content-control statement separate from the content and the edit form, the content-control statement specifying for each of at least some items of the content a control from the edit form to be employed to display the item in the page and thereby binding the content to the edit form;” and “performing one of receiving a selection of a layout statement separate from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement or allowing an editor to create the layout statement separate from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement, the layout statement specifying each item of the content that is to appear in the page, including a layout order of such specified item within the page and any attributes to be applied to such item” as recited in claims 1 and 16.

As recited by the Examiner, “Brandenborg discloses a dynamic Layout Budget which is utilized as a tool for selecting content to be included in a specific issue and editions of news products.” (Office Action ¶ 6). Additionally, metadata may be added to the Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) associated with budgeting. (Page 4, [0047]). The metadata may include a grading that assists the content management system in selecting relevant subset for publishing from a layout budget. (Page 4, [0049]). Merely describing a layout budget as a tool for selecting Publishing Content Objects (PCOs) using metadata and grading does not teach “receiving a selection of an edit form separate from the content,” “receiving a selection of a content-control statement separate from the content and the edit form,” or “performing

one of receiving a selection of a layout statement separate from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement or allowing an editor to create the layout statement separate from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement.” For example, Applicant submits that the layout budget described in Brandenborg is not an edit form separate from the content; a content-control statement separate from the content and the edit form claimed; or a layout statement separate from or created separately from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement as claimed.

Thus, neither the layout budget, the associated metadata, nor other aspects thereof as described in Brandenborg teach “receiving a selection of an edit form separate from the content,” “receiving a selection of a content-control statement separate from the content and the edit form,” or “performing one of receiving a selection of a layout statement separate from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement or allowing an editor to create the layout statement separate from the content, the edit form, and the content-control statement” as recited in claims 1 and 16.

Because the cited references do not teach all of the claimed limitations and such teachings are not as complete in detail as the claimed limitations, the rejections cannot stand. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 1 and 16 and the claims that depend from them is respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2747/303264.01
Application No.: 10/721,146
Office Action Dated: November 15, 2006

PATENT

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Date: February 15, 2007

/Michael P. Dunnam/
Michael P. Dunnam
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439